

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

CHARLIE B. BUSH JR.,)	4:09CV3141
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
MELANIE BAILEY, Counsler, and)	
MICHAEL THURBER, Director of)	
Lancaster County Jail,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On November 5, 2009, the court entered an order that, among other things, directed Plaintiff to serve summons on Defendants no later than 120 days from the filing of the complaint, or by March 4, 2010. (Filing No. [12](#).) Plaintiff has never returned completed summons forms to the Clerk of the court for service on Defendants, and Defendants have not been served with summons. (*See [Docket Sheet](#).*)

Plaintiff shall have 30 days, or until April 19, 2010, to show cause why this case should not be dismissed against Defendants due to Plaintiff's failure to serve summons.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff failed to serve summons on Defendants within 120 days of the filing of the Complaint in this matter. Plaintiff shall have 30 days, or until April 19, 2010, to show cause why this case should not be dismissed against Defendants.

2. If Plaintiff does not respond, or if good cause is not shown, this action will be dismissed against Defendants without further notice.

3. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline with the following text: April 19, 2010: deadline for Plaintiff to show cause why service of process was not completed for Defendants.

DATED this 18th day of March, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon
Chief United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.